

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowable subject matter. Applicant has cancelled Claims 7-14, amended Claim 15 and added Claims 18-25. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed August 9, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 stands currently objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowable subject matter. In response to the Examiner's objection Applicants have amended Claim 15 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly Applicant believes Claim 15 is now in condition for full allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 11 and 13 stand rejected as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/017850 ("Barnes"). Applicant has cancelled Claims 11 and 13. Accordingly, Applicant submits this rejection is now moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 14 stands rejected as obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2002/017850 ("Barnes"). Claims 7 and 9 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,938,150 ("Phillips") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0053555 ("McCorkle"). Claims 8 and 10 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,938,150 ("Phillips"), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0053555 ("McCorkle") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,882,679 ("Somayazulu"). Claims 12 and 16 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2002/017850 ("Barnes") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,381,798 ("Burrows").

Applicant has cancelled Claims 7-14. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the rejection of Claims 7-10, 12 and 14 is now moot.

With respect to Claim 16, however, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 16 is dependent on Claim 15 which is believed to be in condition for full allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 16 is respectfully requested.

New Claims 18-25

Applicant has added new Claims 18-25. These claims contain similar limitations to Claims 15 and 17 which the Examiner has deemed allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the full allowance of Claims 18-25.

CONCLUSION

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowable subject matter. Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 15-25. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant

An G. Akmal
Reg. No. 51,388

Date: November 08, 2005
1301 W. 25th Street, Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9220
Fax. (512) 371-9088